

**REMARKS**

The following remarks form a full and complete response to the Office Action dated January 15, 2010. Applicants have cancelled withdrawn claims 26-46 without prejudice or disclaimer. Claim 25 was previously cancelled without prejudice or disclaimer. Accordingly, claims 1-24 and 47-50 remain pending in the present application and are submitted for reconsideration.

***Claim Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103***

Claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-18, and 21-24

The Office Action rejected claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-18 and 21-24 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,704,060 to Levandowski (“Levandowski”) in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2002/0194596 by Srivastava (“Srivastava”). Applicants traverse the rejection on the basis that claims 1-4, 7-12, 16-18 and 21-24 recite subject matter neither disclosed nor suggested by the combination of Levandowski and Srivastava.

For instance, neither Levandowski nor Srivastava recites a media device having first and second media outputs and first and second control inputs that is “arranged to adopt a predetermined first or second setting as said common setting according to whether control signals are received respectively on said first or second inputs,” as required by claim 1. The Office Action alleges that Levandowski teaches this feature of claim 1. Applicants disagree.

Levandowski generally describes an arrangement by which television signals are provided at a local location and at a remote location. *See* Levandowski at col. 1, line 59 – col. 2, line 23. Levandowski does not, however, disclose or suggest applying settings to the signals. Because Levandowski fails to disclose or suggest applying settings to the signals it cannot and

would not disclose or suggest adopting settings according to whether control signals are received respectively on said first or said second inputs, as required by claim 1. The Office Action suggests that this feature of claim 1 is disclosed by Levandowski's disclosure that the decoder 216 can include a HD/SD audio/video decoder 220. *See* Office Action at 3. However, whether a signal is a high-definition (HD) or standard-definition (SD) signal is not a "setting" that has been "applied" to the signal by the receiver. Instead, a signal's status as either HD or SD is simply a function of the nature of the signal as broadcast. Thus Levandowski fails to disclose or suggest a device "arranged to adopt a predetermined first or second setting as said common setting according to whether control signals are received respectively on said first or second inputs," as required by claim 1.

The Office Action also alleges that Srivastava discloses a device arranged to adopt a predetermined first or second setting as said setting according to whether control signals are received respectively on said first or said second inputs. *See* Office Action at 3. However, like Levandowski, Srivastava fails to disclose or suggest this feature of claim 1.

First, Srivastava simply does not disclose applying a common setting to media signals output on first and second media outputs. Instead, Srivastava merely discloses output to a selected monitor or display device. *See* Srivastava at ¶ 46. Indeed, it is entirely unclear that the device of Srivastava is even capable of simultaneously generating two signal outputs. In fact, if the device disclosed by Srivastava could generate two signal outputs simultaneously, then selection of one of those devices would not be necessary at all.

Second, Srivastava fails to disclose selecting a first or a second common setting according to whether control signals are received on a first or second input, as required by claim 1. Indeed, the portions of Srivastava cited by the Office Action do not even teach first and

second control inputs, which would be necessary for the claimed functionality. That Srivastava would not disclose selecting first or second common settings according to whether control signals are received on first or second input makes sense in view of the fact that the entire purpose of Srivastava is to “provide unified control of all the AV devices connected to [the audio-video platform 130].” *See* Srivastava at Abstract. Hence, Srivastava strives to provide a single central control input at the audio-video platform, which teaches directly away from the present invention.

Thus Levandowski and Srivastava, taken alone or in combination, fail to disclose or suggest a media device arranged to apply a common setting to the media signals output on the first and second media outputs wherein the device is arranged to adopt a predetermined first or second setting as said common setting according to whether control signals are received respectively on said first or second inputs, as required by claim 1. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 1. Claims 2-12 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1 as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 2-12 as well.

Similarly to claim 1, independent claim 16 recites a method of setting a media output for a media device that is arranged to apply a common setting to the media signals output on the first and second media outputs that includes the step of “detecting whether the control signals are received on said first or second inputs, and adopting respectively a predetermined first or second setting as said common setting in response to said detecting step.” As noted above with respect to claim 1, neither Levandowski nor Srivastava discloses or suggests this feature of claim 16. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 16. Claims 17

– 24 depend from claim 16 and are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 16 as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 17-24 as well.

Claims 5, 6, 13-15, 19, 20, and 47-50

The Office Action rejected claims 5, 6, 13-15, 19, 20 and 47-50 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Levandowski in view of Srivastava and U.S. Patent No. 6,104,865 to Hamaguchi et al. (“Hamaguchi”). Applicants traverse the rejection on the basis that claims 5, 6, 13-15, 19, 20 and 47-50 disclose subject matter neither disclosed nor suggested by the combination of Levandowski, Srivastava, and Hamaguchi.

Claims 5 and 6 depend from claim 1 and are patentable for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 1.

With regard to independent claim 13, the combination of Levandowski, Srivastava, and Hamaguchi fails to disclose or suggest a television broadcast receiver that is arranged to detect whether a control signal is received by an infrared receiver or at an auxiliary control input and to apply selectively a first or a second picture format to the video signal, dependant on the detection. The Office Action alleges that this feature is disclosed by Srivastava. *See* Office Action at 8. Applicants, however, disagree.

The Office Action indicates that Srivastava discloses, in relation to IR blaster 138, “an auxiliary control input for receiving control signals from the remote control via a remote control extender.” *See* Office Action at 8. However, the only reference to the IR blaster in the portion of Srivastava cited by the Examiner indicates that the IR blaster may be used to control the HD TV and SD TV monitors 170 and 174. *See* Srivastava at ¶¶ 18 and 23. Hence, Srivastava

merely discloses sending controls by the IR blaster instead of receiving control signals.

Paragraph 23 simply discloses registering IR remote control commands for audio visual components with the audio visual platform 130 so that the audio visual platform 130 can control those components.

The Office Action also asserts that Srivastava discloses “the receiver arranged to detect whether a control signal is received by the infrared receiver or at the auxiliary control input.” *See* Office Action at 8 (citing Srivastava at ¶ 20). Paragraph 20, however, merely discloses using the AVP 130 to centrally control master mode and legacy devices connected to the AVP. There is simply no disclosure of any detection being made as to whether a control signal is received by the infrared receiver or at the auxiliary control input. Indeed, this cannot be the case, as the IR blaster 138 is not used as an auxiliary control input. Instead, the IR blaster 138 is used to send control signals to AV devices connected to the audio/visual platform 130.

The Office Action alleges that Srivastava also discloses “to apply selectively a first or a second video signal, dependent on said detection.” *See* Office Action at 8 (citing Srivastava at ¶¶ 21-22). First, “to apply selectively a first or a second video signal, dependent on said detection” is not an element of the claim – claim 13 requires applying selectively a first or a second said picture format to said signal, dependent on said detection. Second, Srivastava does not disclose making detection, as discussed above. Indeed, the cited portions of Srivastava appear to disclose merely details regarding the way the AV devices connected to the audio visual platform 130 may be centrally controlled by sending control signals to the audio visual platform 130.

Thus, contrary to the Office Action, Srivastava fails to disclose or suggest a television broadcast receiver that is arranged to detect whether a control signal is received by an infrared

receiver or at an auxiliary control input and to apply selectively a first or a second picture format to the video signal, dependant on the detection, as required by claim 13. Furthermore, the Office Action cites no portion (and Applicants can find no portion) of either Levandowski or Hamaguchi that discloses this feature of claim 13. Thus, the combination of Levandowski, Srivastava, and Hamaguchi fails to disclose or suggest each and every feature of the claimed invention. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claim 13. Claims 14-15 depend from claim 13 and are patentable over the combination of Levandowski, Srivastava, and Hamaguchi for at least the same reason stated above with respect to claim 13 as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 14-15.

Similarly to claim 13, independent claim 47 recites a method of applying a picture format to a video signal of a television broadcast receiver that includes detecting whether a control signal is received by the infrared receiver or at the auxiliary control input and applying selectively a first or a second picture format to the video signal, dependent on the detection. As discussed above with respect to claim 13, the combination of Levandowski, Srivastava, and Hamaguchi entirely fails to disclose or suggest this feature. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request withdrawal of the rejection of claim 47. Claims 48-50 depend from claim 47 and are patentable over the combination of Levandowski, Srivastava, and Hamaguchi for at least the same reasons stated above with respect to claim 47 as well as for the additional features they recite. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request the withdrawal of the rejection of claims 48-50.

**CONCLUSION**

As each of the rejections and objections has been addressed, Applicants submit that claims 1-24 and 47-50 are patentable for at least the reasons set forth above. Applicants therefore request that the Office allow claims 1-24 and 47-50 and pass the application to issue.

Any fees for such an extension, including the fees set forth under 37 C.F.R. § 1.17(a)(3), together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account No. 02-2135.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the Applicants' undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: April 15, 2010

By: /John H. Curry  
John H. Curry  
*Attorney for Applicants*  
Registration No. 65,067  
ROTHWELL, FIGG, ERNST &  
MANBECK, p.c.  
Suite 800, 1425 K Street, N.W.  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202)783-6040